



IN THE HIGH COURT OF PUNJAB AND HARYANA
AT CHANDIGARH

225

CRM-M-43366-2025

HARJINDER SINGH

.....Petitioner

Versus

STATE OF PUNJAB

.....Respondent

CRM-M-50275-2025

JAGROOP SINGH @ JUPA

.....Petitioner

Versus

STATE OF PUNJAB

.....Respondent

Decided on : 17.02.2026

CORAM: HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE SANJAY VASHISTH

Present: Mr. Yagsimant Attri, Advocate,
for the petitioners (in both the cases).

Mr. Jasdeep Singh, Addl. AG, Punjab.

Ms. Poonam Singh Thakur, Advocate,
for the complainant.

SANJAY VASHISTH, J.

1. By this common order, both the aforementioned petitions,
i.e. CRM-M-43366-2025 and CRM-M-50275-2025 shall stand disposed
of.

2. The instant petitions has been filed under Section 483 of
BNSS, 2023 (earlier Section 439 Cr.P.C.), for grant of regular bail to the
petitioners, during the pendency of trial, who have been booked in a



criminal case arising out of First Information Report, as detailed hereunder:-

Name of Petitioner(s)	FIR No.	Date	Section(s)	Police Station	Distri ct
(1) Jagroop Singh @ Jupa, aged about 25 years; (2) Harjinder Singh, aged about 56 years	105	17.12.2024	103(1), 109, 61(2), 62, 190, 191(3), 351(2) of BNS, and 25, 27 of Arms Act, and offence under sections 117(2), 118(1) of BNS has been added later on	Chohla Sahib	Tarn Taran

2. An FIR was registered on the statement of the complainant, Mahinder Singh, who alleged that he is the owner of 22 acres of land situated across the Beas River in the Mand area, which also includes the land owned by his uncle (Chacha) and great-uncle (Taya). He further claimed that he has been cultivating and irrigating this land for the past 25 years. As per the complainant, individuals from the accused party—namely Balwinder Singh, Daljit Singh (son of Shamir Singh), and Nishan Singh, have been asserting ownership rights over the same land.

On the day of the incident, at around 5:15 p.m., complainant went to his fields along with his son Harpreet Singh and nephews Shamsher Singh and Davinder Singh to sow wheat using their Mahindra 275 tractor (red in colour). Upon arrival, they noticed that the accused persons were already present on the disputed land, engaged in sowing wheat using an Arjan tractor. An altercation took place between the two parties, which escalated and resulted in the use of firearms. During the incident, Shamsher Singh sustained fatal injuries and lost his life, while



Davinder Singh also suffered injuries. Specific roles in the incident, assigned to the members of the accused party in the FIR, are as under:-

Sr. No	Name of accused persons	Arm	Role
1.	Jagtar Singh	Pistol	Raised <i>lalkara</i> of catching hold and to teach lesson
2.	Balwinder Singh	<i>Dang</i>	Raised <i>lalkara</i> of catching hold and to teach lesson
3.	Arshdeep Singh	<i>Dang</i>	
4.	Jagroop Singh @ Jupa	<i>Dattar</i>	
5.	Veer Singh	Single barrel gun	
6.	Nishan Singh	.12 bore gun	Fired at chest of Shamsher Singh
7.	Jodhbir Singh	Empty handed	
8.	Akashdeep Singh	.12 bore gun	Fired at Davinder Singh at left buttock
9.	Avtar Singh	<i>Gandasa</i>	
10.	Joban Singh	Base ball	
11.	Daljit Singh	Empty handed	
12.	Harjinder Singh	<i>Dang</i>	
13.	Kagga Singh	Hockey	
14.	Palwinder Singh	Empty handed	Driving the tractor and attempted to run over his tractor on the complainant

3. Learned counsel for the petitioners contends that, in connection with the same incident, a cross-version has been recorded, vide DDR No.18 dated 26.12.2024 at the instance of co-accused Davinder Singh, highlighting that members of the petitioner’s party also



sustained injuries during the occurrence. Referring to this factual position, counsel submits that it will be a significant issue before learned trial Court to determine, which party was the aggressor and who holds actual possession of the disputed land.

It is further submitted that petitioners' father and forefathers have been cultivating approximately 40 acres of land in the Mand area, situated across the Beas River, for the past about 14 years. Complainant party, too, has possession of around 15–16 acres of land in the same vicinity. However, since the fields lack demarcated boundaries, disputes have repeatedly arisen concerning actual possession of specific parcels of land. In fact, on the same issue, an earlier FIR No.11 dated 24.02.2024 had been registered at Police Station Chohla Sahib, District Tarn Taran, against the complainant side.

4. It is further argued by learned counsel for the petitioners that one of the co-accused, Yodbir Singh, who was allegedly empty-handed and not attributed any specific injury, has already been granted the concession of anticipatory bail by this Court, vide order dated 21.07.2025 passed in CRM-M-34551-2025 (Annexure P-2).

5. It is further submitted that as per the FIR, petitioner-Jagroop Singh @ Joopa is alleged to have been armed with a *dattar*, while petitioner-Harjinder Singh is alleged to have been armed with a *daang*. However, there is no specific allegation that either of them used the said weapons to inflict any injury upon any member of the victim side. In this context, it is contended that, in the absence of any corroborative or specific evidence, other than a verbal allegation, petitioners, who are



neither shown to be armed with a firearm nor alleged to have caused any grievous injury, deserves to be treated at par with co-accused Yodbir Singh, and, are therefore, entitled to the concession of regular bail. Further submits that such a general allegation, without any overt act or substantive evidence, should not be a ground to deny the concession of regular bail.

Moreover, both the petitioners are inside jail since 02.01.2025, i.e. 01 year 01 month and 09 days. Investigation has been completed in the present case and *challan* has already been presented. There is a list of total 31 prosecution witnesses, and process of recording of statements of the prosecution witnesses is yet to start. Thus, counsel prays for grant of regular bail to both the petitioners in the present case.

6. In response to the arguments addressed by learned counsel for the petitioners, learned State counsel, produces the custody certificate dated 16.02.2026 (in both the cases) in the Court today, which are taken on record. Office to tag the same at appropriate place. A copy thereof has been handed over to the counsel for the petitioner.

As per the custody certificates, in the present case, both the petitioners have already undergone 01 year 01 month and 09 days period inside jail and both the petitioners are not involved in any other criminal case in the past.

7. Learned State counsel, along with learned counsel for the complainant, while opposing the prayer and submissions advanced by learned counsel for the petitioners, submits that until the complainant and the eye-witnesses are examined, there exists a reasonable apprehension



that petitioners may extend threats to the witnesses or tamper with the evidence by influencing them, in case, they are released on bail. Therefore, they jointly pray for dismissal of the present petitions.

8. This Court has heard the submissions advanced by learned counsel for the parties and has carefully perused the record available before it.

9. In view of totality of the circumstances and nature of the allegations levelled against the petitioners, as well as the factors noticed here above, including the period of incarceration already undergone by both of them and the present stage of the trial, this Court is of the considered opinion that it would be appropriate to grant the concession of bail to both the petitioners in the present cases.

Consequently, prayer made in the present petitions are **allowed**. Petitioners namely Harjinder Singh and Jagroop Singh @ Jupa are ordered to be released on bail, subject to their furnishing bail/surety bonds to the satisfaction of the learned trial Court/ Chief Judicial Magistrate/ Illaqa Magistrate/ Duty Magistrate concerned, if not required in any other case.

10. Needless to observe that the petitioners shall not extend any threat and shall not influence any prosecution witness in any manner directly or indirectly.

11. Any of the discussion done and recorded here above, shall not be construed as an expression of opinion on the facts of the case. Therefore, trial Court is expected to decide the case by taking an



independent view, on the basis of evidence available on record, as expeditiously as possible, in accordance with law.

- 12. Both the petitions stand disposed of.
- 13. A photocopy of this order be placed on the file of other connected case.

(SANJAY VASHISTH)
JUDGE

17.02.2026
Lavisha

Whether Speaking/Reasoned: YES/~~NO~~
Whether Reportable: ~~YES~~/NO